

Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Superfund Site
Discussion with Dr. Hunnicutt, Chair of the Mayor's Hunters Point Shipyard Citizen Advisory Committee
Internal Talking Points | Meeting: February 5, 2021

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

We appreciate the opportunity to talk with you, as you are an important leader in the community and can help us better understand the community's perspective, including concerns and frustrations.

- We wanted to hear from you on any recent concerns being raised from the Committee or the community on the Navy's cleanup work at the site. Last September, you raised some real fears and frustrations about miscommunications surrounding the work at Hunters Point. Continued forward movement and EPA is a prime player for continued progress.
- We hadn't connected after we issued our Parcel A fact sheet. Have you heard any reactions from the community on that document? The fact sheet was wonderful to provide clarity and a counter narrative to the disinformation the community.

We wanted to provide you an update on the ongoing conversations between the Navy and EPA on the remediation goals for the current, onsite buildings.

- At the end of the day, EPA wants to be confident that it will be safe for people/families to live in any building the Navy transfers to the City that has an end use determination of residential.
- It's not typical for potentially-radiologically contaminated buildings to be cleared for residential use. We are not aware of an example where this has happened. HPNS is really unique in this way. Why the Navy won't just demo the buildings? Navy doesn't typically demolish buildings... but, it's not out of the discussion.
- In my email last week, I shared a December letter from EPA's Superfund Division Director to the Navy. In that letter, EPA is asking the Navy to address concerns we have continued to raise regarding its RESRAD Build. We asked the Navy to provide evidence of background levels and to explain why they believe achieving lower cleanup goals is infeasible.
- What aspects of this are meaningful for public discourse?

....forthcoming February 22, 2021 HPS CAC meeting?

- Last September, you were looking for EPA to directly communicate the work at Hunters Point with the public. It's an unusual ask when the Navy is present, as it is the Navy's responsibility to be a spokesperson for the work it is doing at HP.
- At the same time, EPA can play a role in helping the Navy with communications.
- And, would like to hear from you on your expectations of EPA for this meeting. EPA has always been present. "It's up to you." John mentioned our field oversight work.
- What are the next steps with the radiological retesting? Kasheica will provide Dr. H the presentation the Navy recently did, which included an anticipated schedule of the cleanup and retesting work.

- SFMTA meeting about work in the Bayview. The shipyard came up... and they said it would take about 2 more years someone else said it should take 20 years.
- Open house meeting in March the Navy is planning. We would want some type of graphic that is "lay person" friendly.

For Federal Facilities Superfund Program sites, a federal entity other than EPA has "lead cleanup authority" and is referred to as the lead agency.

- This designation is written into the law and regulations.
- Lead agencies are provided with the resources needed to implement environmental investigation and cleanup work, carry out community involvement, and communicate its work to the public.
- EPA is provided a *small* amount of resources to fulfill our oversight responsibility on federal facilities. At Hunters Point, I have two RPMs assigned, while the Navy has over 7. The Navy also has many contractors, including contractors focused on its community outreach work. We are simply not resourced in the same way.

For the Hunters Point, the Navy is the lead agency.

- We have an **oversight role** along with our *equal* partners at the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board).
- **Our role is to review the Navy's work** and determine its compliance with the Superfund laws, regulations, and policies.
 - Over the past three years, we have provided many comment letters to the Navy on the radiological retesting work.
 - I work closely with the technical project manager to try to make these comment letters plain language and a good explanation of the Navy's work.
 - All of these are on our website for the public to review.
 - Because our work primarily focuses on ways the Navy can improve work plans, we question the value of highlighting that work in public presentations or pushing out communications to the public.
- We have been operating under the principles of Federal Facilities Program where **the Navy is the spokesperson** for its cleanup work and any aspects related to that work.
 - The Navy's responsibility includes addressing the public's concerns, including concerns about exposure to site contaminated or general health.
 - We have seen the Navy struggle with doing this well.
 - EPA management thought that the Navy would see me as a resource to work with them on its external communications. However, the Navy has not been receptive of this partnership.